

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

It is noted that the 6/4/04 Office Action was mailed to the prior counsel in this matter. It is respectfully requested that all future correspondence should be sent to the present counsel in this matter. A copy of a Revocation of Prior Powers and Appointment of New Counsel By Assignee, which has been previously submitted in this matter, is provided herewith for ease of reference.

### DRAWINGS

The Office Action states that formal drawings are required to be submitted in connection with this matter. As shown above formal drawings are submitted herewith.

### SPECIFICATION

The Office Action objects to the specification, on grounds related to the use of an “embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code” and refers to MPEP §608.01. A review of the MPEP §608.01 shows that the patent application should not include hyperlinks or other forms of browser executable code. It appears that the USPTO concern is that when such a patent is published, such text in a published patent would act as a link through the USPTO website.

It is respectfully submitted that while the present application does refer to use of hyperlinks, and does at a number of locations use the text “schwab.com”, the use of such text alone, without the use of the other additional text as “www” preceding schwab.com, or “http://” is not an actual hyperlink or browser executable code. It is respectfully submitted that the undersigned has reviewed the text of the pending application and has not found any browser executable code, such as an actual hyperlink. If the undersigned has overlooked a portion of text which is of concern, the Examiner is respectfully requested to direct attention to the text, so that it can be addressed.

### OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

The Office Action appears to object to the numbering provided in the originally filed claims. Although the claim, or claims, which are objected to are not specifically identified in the Office Action, it appears that the objection may have been based on dependent claims 36 which

depended from claim 24. It is respectfully submitted that as shown above claim 36 is one of the previously pending claims which has been canceled; thus, it is respectfully submitted that this issue has now been addressed.

### **35 USC §112 REJECTION**

Claims 4 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC §112. Claim 4 appears to have been rejected because of the use of the word "approximately". It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is overcome by the amendment shown above. Further, as shown above claim 27 has been canceled.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS BASED ON CITED REFERENCES**

All of the previously pending independent claims were rejected as being anticipated by US Patent no. 5,875,296 (Shi). The present amendment amends claims 1, 2, 4 and 14; and adds claims 38-44; and cancels claims 23-37. This cancellation of claims is done to expedite prosecution of the now pending claims, and without prejudice to filing a continuation case to pursue additional claims. Following entry of this amendment claims 1-22 and 38-44 are pending in this case.

### **Patentability of Amended Claim 1:**

The present amendment, cancels all of the originally pending independent claims, except claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended as shown above.

The Shi reference teaches a system which does not anticipate, or suggest anything analogous to, the method now recited in claim 1. Basically, as discussed in the Abstract of Shi, and as discussed in much of the text of Shi which is cited in the 6/4/04 Office Action, Shi provides a system where by a user can login to a system and obtain access to a distributed file system using web server authentication cookie information. However, it is respectfully submitted that nothing in Shi discloses or suggests a system where a configuration file resides on a central domain server, and the configuration file contains a list which determines which applications have read access and write access to different fields of a cookie file.

It is respectfully submitted that this ability to provide different applications with restricted access to some but not all cookie fields of a cookie file, provides for enhanced security

of sensitive data which can be stored in different cookie fields of a cookie file. Thus, where an application need access to some but not all of the data in cookie file, the configuration file can contain a list which provides the application with access only to the necessary data in the cookie file, and thereby protects the data which is not needed by the particular application. It is respectfully that this ability to selectively provide access to some but not all of the information in a cookie is very different than the teaching of Shi. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the Shi reference. Further claims 2-22 depend from claim 1 and are respectfully submitted to be patentable over Shi for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

### **Patentability Newly Added Claim 38**

As shown above claim 38 is a newly added claim which recites among other things a configuration file, as discussed above in connection with claim 1. Further claim 38 provides for controlling access to cookie fields of the cookie file based on the list in configuration file. As discussed above in connection with claim 1, it is respectfully submitted this operation is not anticipated, or suggested, by the teaching of Shi.

In addition to the above, claim 38 also contains additional very significant elements. For example, claim 38 recites a first application transmits first application user event data to a first application interface library. The first application interface library then determines if user event data is a first type of event, in which case a cookie library is used to update a field in the cookie file. If the first application interface library determines that the user event data is of a second type of data, then the user data is transmitted through message queuing middleware. This operation is very different than all of the discussion provided in Shi. The operation provided for by the method of claim 38 allows for the application interface library to control whether information is passed via cookie files which would provide for real-time transmission of the information to other applications in the distributed system; or for larger amounts of information, and less time sensitive information, the application interface library can provide for using message queuing middleware to pass user event data.

Thus, claim 38 thus combines two important operations (1) use of a configuration list to control application access to fields of a cookie file; and (2) the operation of an application interface library to determine whether to transmit information through fields of a cookie file, or through message queuing middleware. The combination of the these two operations then

provides for a powerful and flexible method for providing an integration of distributed applications. It is respectfully submitted that this method is patentable over the cited references. Further, claims 39-44 depend from claim 38 and are submitted to be patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as claim 38.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the pending claims and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-1703, under Order No. SCHB-1600. **A duplicate copy of the transmittal cover sheet attached to this Response to Office Action Mailed June 4, 2004, is provided herewith.**

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: September 29, 2004

By: 

Brian J. Keating  
Reg. No. 39,520

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

- Attachments:
1. Copy of Revocation of Prior Powers and Appointment of New Counsel By Assignee (w/return receipt postcard filed 08/05/2002)
  2. Copy of Resubmitted Revocation of Prior Powers and Appointment of New Counsel By Assignee (w/return receipt postcard filed 01/09/2004)
  3. Submission of Replacement Formal Drawings (including 7 sheets of formal drawings)
  4. Information Disclosure Statement (with PTO-1449)
  5. Change of Attorney or Agent's Address in Application (37 CFR 1.8(a))